

Shields, Joyce, Hanser, Lawrence, Williams, Edward, CPT and Popelka, Beverly,
U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences,
Alexandria, Virginia. (Wed. PM)

Pilot Research for Validation of ASVAB and Enlistment Standards Against
Performance on the Job

The Army Research Institute (ARI) conducted an initial pilot research project in the 193rd Infantry Brigade, Panama to determine the feasibility of validating the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) and enlistment standards against performance on the job. This report discusses some preliminary analyses of these data. The preliminary analyses focus on two areas. The first area deals with the definition of a "successful soldier," and the extent to which commanding officers and NCO's agreed on the qualities of a "successful soldier." The second area deals with the relations among ASVAB 5/6/7, SQTs, and selected preliminary measures of job performance. The results suggest that the three most important factors in overall soldier performance as indicated by supervisor consist of job performance, troop responsibility, and discipline. The relationship between ASVAB and existing measures of job performance (e.g., SQT scores, awards, honor graduate, and letter of appreciation) are also discussed.

Pilot Research for Validation of ASVAB and
Enlistment Standards Against Performance on the Job

Joyce L. Shields, Lawrence M. Hanser, Edward W. Williams, and Beverly A. Popelka

U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
Alexandria, Virginia 22333

In January 1976, the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) was introduced as the single DOD selection and classification battery. The ASVAB provides an Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) score, which consists of the word knowledge, arithmetic reasoning, and space perception subtests. This test is the basic DOD enlistment test required by Congress as a means of screening applicants for overall trainability and English language proficiency. The remaining components in the ASVAB were derived from the individual service classification test batteries, and are used for the differential assignment of volunteers to specific inservice Technical training courses. In all, ASVAB (Forms 5, 6, and 7) contains 13 subtests. These subtests along with a brief description of each are listed in Table 1.

For Army use, ASVAB subtests are further combined into nine Aptitude Area Composites. Minimum scores on these composites are used as a prerequisite for entering skill training programs. Successful completion of the training program results in the award of a Military Occupational Specialty (MOS). For example, one Aptitude Area Composite is labeled CO for Combat and is used to classify recruits into Infantry and Armor specialties; another composite is labeled EL, for Electronics Repair, and is used for all electronics repair specialties in the signal and air defense fields (Maier & Grafton, 1981). The Aptitude Area Composites along with the types of skill specialties for which the composites serve as prerequisites are shown in Table 2.

Miscalibration of ASVAB Scoring Table

Subsequent studies revealed that a miscalibration occurred in the ASVAB 5/6/7 scoring table during its development. As a result, the Services enlisted recruits who would have been turned away, because of low test scores if the ASVAB had been calibrated correctly.

The calibration problem and congressional interest as to its impact prompted the issuance of a memorandum dated 11 September 1980 from Robert B. Pirie Jr., directing all services to pursue a long range systematic program to validate ASVAB and enlistment standards against performance on the job. The Army Research Institute (ARI) conducted an initial pilot research project in the 193rd Infantry Brigade, Panama to determine the feasibility of validating enlistment standards

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of the U. S. Army Research Institute or the Department of the Army.

against performance on the job. This report discusses some preliminary analyses of these data. Our preliminary analyses focuses on two areas. The first area deals with the definition of a "successful soldier", and the extent to which Commanding Officers and NCO's agreed on the qualities of a "successful soldier". The second area deals with the relations among ASVAB 6/7, SQTs and selected preliminary measures of job performance.

Agreement Between Officers and NCOs on the Importance of Rating Factors

A total of 526 first-term soldiers participated in the research. In addition, 26 Company Commanders and 26 First Sergeants, from the units representing the tested troops, along with a total of 203 first line supervisors (squad leaders) completed job performance ratings and rankings on these same first-term soldiers. Combat units representing the Infantry; and support units representing Military Intelligence, Military Police, Transportation, and Medical specialties were included in the study.

As part of a special data collection, ARI researchers investigated (1) the extent to which Company Commanders and their First Sergeants agree on what it means to be a successful or unsuccessful soldier, and (2) more importantly to find out which of these indicators are considered to be the most important to Commanders and First Sergeants presently in the field. Three types of data were collected from Company Commanders and First Sergeants to focus on this issue:

- 1) Each was asked to rate 49 factors which could be used to measure the quality of a soldier's job performance. Ratings were on a scale of importance as indicators of job performance.
- 2) Each was asked to independently choose the ten most successful and the ten least successful soldiers from among first-term troops in his company.
- 3) Each was asked to list several observable behaviors exhibited by these soldiers which would indicate why a soldier had been chosen as one of the most or least successful.

Average ratings of the 49 individual job performance factors are attached as Appendix A. Averages were calculated across all raters as well as separately for Company Commanders and First Sergeants. Note that it appears that First Sergeants generally tended to rate items as more important than Company Commanders. This probably indicates a different response set rather than true differences. However, it is interesting to note that this trend is reversed for ratings of Discipline Factors. First Sergeants generally considered these factors as less important than Company Commanders.

In Appendix B, the 49 factors are grouped into those generally considered 'Extremely Important', 'Very Important', 'Important', and 'Somewhat Important.' These groupings provide a broad overview of what is considered important or not important by command personnel of the 193rd Inf Bde, Panama for evaluating job performance.

Ratings of the 49 factors were also checked for agreement both within companies (Commanding Officer and First Sergeant) as well as across all respondents. The range of agreement between a CO and his 1SG varied from a low of $-.08$ to a high of $.60$. Of 23 companies eligible for this analysis, acceptable agreement between Commanders and First Sergeants occurred in 13 companies ($.33+$), in our judgment. The average level of agreement across all 23 companies responding is $.28$.

Company Commanders and First Sergeants were also asked to select their 10 most and 10 least successful soldiers and to list specific characteristics of accomplishments used in selecting them. Although responses were received in many content areas (e.g., job performance, troop responsibilities, relationship with others, respect for authority, motivation, and personal behavior), the major areas of agreement between Company Commanders and First Sergeants were in the content areas of job performance, troop responsibilities, and personal behavior/discipline. Table 3 summarizes the characteristics and accomplishments that were common to both the Commander's and First Sergeant's lists of the 10 most and 10 least successful soldiers.

Preliminary Conclusions

These data provide some interesting suggestions, both for practical application as well as future research. It's interesting to note that the three factors identified as "extremely important" for indicating quality of job performance (Appendix B): (1) performs job satisfactorily; (2) accepts responsibility; and (3) resists authority, correspond to the major categories within which comments from Company Commanders and First Sergeants fall; that is, job performance, troop responsibility, and discipline. Thus, these data serve to corroborate one another.

The moderate level of agreement among Company Commanders and First Sergeants suggests that while there is a kernel of agreement regarding what is meant by good job performance, there is room for improvement. This baseline level of agreement is sufficiently high, however, to cause us to be optimistic about the possible future utility of supervisory ratings of job performance. As indicated previously, it is felt that an organized effort to clarify these concepts among supervisory personnel would have a direct impact on improving job performance.

Interesting questions which arise from the data include:

1. How do military personnel arrive at a concept of good job performance?
2. Why are letters of appreciation not considered more important as indicators of job performance?
3. How does one operationalize concepts such as "accepts responsibility" and "resists authority"?

Relationship Among ASVAB 6/7, SQTs, and Selected Measures of Job Performance

The second phase of the preliminary analysis focused on the relations among ASVAB 6/7, SQTs, and selected measures of job performance. The central problem of validating enlistment standards and tests against actual job performance is that no measure of job performance exists in the Army. With the absence of such a measure we attempted to estimate the quality of an individual's performance by assessing various indicators that have some logical, although imperfect relationship to job performance. The indicators used included (1) Skill Qualification Test Scores, (2) Number of awards, (3) Number of additional military courses completed, (4) Number of letter of appreciation, (5) Number of Article 15's (6) Honor graduate status in training schools, and (7) Peer and supervisory ratings and rankings.

Analysis

The preliminary analyses consisted of computing simple correlations among Aptitude Area Composite scores and job performance measures.

Correlations were computed for 11B's and 95B's separately, as well as for the total sample. Correlation matrices were not computed for samples having less than 50 soldiers. Thus, 63B's, 64C's and 91B's were not analyzed separately; however, these MOSs were included in the analysis of the total sample. Finally, correlation coefficients were computed to determine the agreement between platoon sergeants on first-term soldiers' job performance. For this analysis the platoon leader's and platoon sergeant's rankings were correlated.

Results and Discussion

Two major issues were considered: (1) the meaning and quality of the various criterion measures, and (2) the relationships between scores on ASVAB 6/7 and criterion measures. The results of the analyses appear in Table 4 through 9.

Table 4 shows the extent of agreement between platoon leader and platoon sergeant rankings of first term soldiers in six platoons where sufficient data existed to perform this analysis. The average agreement was $r = 0.78$. This result indicates that there is reasonable consensual agreement between platoon leaders and platoon sergeants with regard to which soldiers are "good" soldiers and which soldiers are "poor" soldiers.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 are identical except for the sample on which the correlations were calculated. Table 5 includes the total sample from Panama; Table 6 includes only soldiers in MOS 11B; Table 7 includes only soldiers in MOS 95B. There are a number of substantial and interesting relations found in Table 5. For example soldiers who perform better on SQTs also tend to have received more awards ($r = .43$), and to have completed more additional military training courses

such as airborne school ($r = .34$). It may be that these soldiers perform better on SQTs because they are better trained, or perhaps their higher scores on SQTs and enrollment in additional military training are both the result of a higher level of motivation. Note that subjective ranking tends to be correlated with behavior ($r = .27$), such as SQT performance, which could be observed by platoon leaders. This suggests that these subjective rankings are not merely a reflection of popularity, but probably are grounded in actual performance as well. Similar results appear in Table 6 for the 11B MOS. For example, platoon leaders apparently are cognizant of Article 15's, and rank lower a soldier who has received them ($r = .33$).

In all three Tables, a significant relation exists between peer and platoon leader rankings. It is difficult to determine, from these data, the basis on which peer rankings were given, however, their correlations with platoon leader rankings indicate that they too are more than the result of a popularity contest. The paucity of significant relations for the 95B sample (Table 7) is inexplicable. It may be a reflection of the smaller sample size, or perhaps a reflection of true differences between the 95B and 11B samples. Tables 8 and 9 contain the correlations of the various criterion measures with Aptitude Area Composite scores from ASVAB 6/7. Before discussing the content of the Tables a few points need to be addressed.

In 1980 an error in the calibration of ASVAB 6/7 scores was discovered. This error had the impact of substantially lowering enlistment standards. That is, recruits were enlisted who would not have qualified had the ASVAB 6/7 been calibrated correctly. Analyses reported here are based on a recalibration of ASVAB 6/7 to the correct level. In the course of the analyses, it was discovered that, of the soldiers tested in Panama, sixty-four 11Bs and thirty-one 95Bs would not have been qualified for reenlistment under the corrected calibration of ASVAB 6/7. The impact of this result is not addressed as part of this report.

The soldiers who participated in the data collection in Panama initially were qualified for enlistment on the basis of their ASVAB 6/7 scores. The measures and standard deviations for each Aptitude Area Composite in an unselected population are 100 and 20, respectively. Because entry into the 11B MOS is on the basis of scores on the CO Aptitude Area Composite, explicit selection has occurred on this variable. By explicit selection, we mean that recruits were classified into an MOS based on their score on a specific composite (a minimum score of 90 was required on CO for enlistment in 11B, and a minimum score of 100 was required on ST for enlistment in 95B). This results in a restricted range of scores for the selected group on the explicit selection variable.

The same restriction has occurred for 95B and ST. One indication of this is that CO for 11Bs and ST for 95Bs have the smallest standard deviation within each group. As a result, all correlations with CO for 11Bs and ST for 95Bs have been corrected for the effects of explicit selection on one variable by a formula provided in Lord and Novick (1968). Since the Aptitude Area Composite scores are correlated among themselves, correlations with other composites are also likely to be slightly depressed.

The descriptive information provided by the means and standard deviations in Tables 8 and 9 provide interesting insight. The standard deviations indicate that, as a group, soldiers in the 11B MOS have more widely variable ability as measured by the ASVAB 6/7 than soldiers in the 95B MOS. However, note that soldiers in the 95B MOS have a generally higher level of ability. In fact the mean difference on composites ranges from approximately 6 to 16 points. One interesting result is that on the basis of mean composite scores, the soldiers in the 95B MOS are more qualified to be in the Infantry than the 11Bs (96.34 vs. 90.21). The Army's current differential classification system is demonstrated here, in that even though the 95Bs would have qualified for entry into the 11B MOS training, they were also qualified for entry into 95B MOS training; which requires a higher Aptitude Area Composite Score on ST than 11B MOS requires in CO.

Turning next to the correlations themselves, the first result is the differing pattern of correlations for the 11B and 95B samples. Again, this could be either an artifact of sample size or a reflection of true differences. For both groups the correlations between SQTs and the ASVAB composites are large, ranging from $r = .30$ to $r = .63$. The validity of the Army's classification system is supported partially by the result that CO for 11Bs and ST for 95Bs show the highest correlation with SQTs, respectively. Further, even if all composites are corrected for restriction in range the above is still true. A final comparison between the 11B and 95B data shows that peer rank exhibits reasonably high correlations with ASVAB composites for 95Bs, but no correlations for 11B. The complete lack of correlation in the 11B sample at the very least indicates that the criterion measures used by enlisted personnel to rank on the job performance of peers differs from the 95B to 11B group.

While the remaining correlations are somewhat smaller they may be worth considering. The number of small but significant correlations between the Composites and awards, additional military courses, and Honor graduate status indicates that ASVAB is predictive of other indicators of job performance.

Finally, while these data seem to indicate a relationship between ASVAB scores and job performance, it is still too early to determine if it will be feasible to set enlistment standards based on job performance. Much work remains to be done in refining existing measures of performance or developing composites of existing measures of performance for occupational specialties within the broad occupational areas we have examined.

Table 1

Content - ASVAB Forms 5, 6, and 7

<u>Test</u>	<u>No. of Items</u>	<u>Time (Minutes)</u>	<u>Test Descriptions</u>
General Information (GI)	15	07	A test on knowledge of geography, sports, history, automobiles.
Numerical Operations (NO)	50	03	A speed test of the four arithmetic operations- addition, subtraction, multiplication, division.
Attention to Detail (AD)	30	05	A test of clerical speed and accuracy by counting the number of "C"s embedded in a series of "O"s. Involves knowledge of word meaning.
Word Knowledge (WK)*	30	10	A test of knowledge of word meanings.
Arithmetic Reasoning (AR)*	20	20	A test of reasoning and arithmetic processes.
Space Perception (SP)*	20	12	A test which involves the selection of three dimensional figures which are formed by folding the pattern.
Mathematics Knowledge (MK)	20	20	A test of knowledge and skills in algebra, geometry, and fractions.
Electronic Information (EI)	30	15	A test of knowledge of elementary principles of electricity and electronics.

Table 1 continued

Mechanical Comprehension (MC)	20	15	A test involving mechanical principles such as gears, pulleys, and hydraulics.
General Science (GS)	20	10	A test involving knowledge of physical and biological sciences.
Shop Information (SI)	20	08	A test involving knowledge of shop procedures and the use of tools.
Automotive Information (AI)	20	10	A test involving knowledge of auto repairs and recognition of symptoms of various malfunctions.
TOTAL	<u>295</u>	<u>135</u>	

* Scores on these three subtests are added together to provide AFQT scores.

Note: The Army Classification Inventory (87 items and about 20 minutes in time) is administered along with Form 6 and 7 as part of the operational testing procedure.

Table 2

Aptitude Area Composites (6 & 7)
and Prerequisite for Major Groups of Army MOS

<u>Area Aptitude Composite</u>	<u>ASVAB 6/7 Subtests</u>	<u>Military Occupational Specialties (MOS)</u>
CO (Combat)	AR+SI+SP+AD+CC	Infantry, Armor, Combat Engineer
FA (Field Artillery)	AR+GI+MK+EI+CA	Field Cannon and Rocket Artillery
EL (Electronics Repair)	AR+EI+SI+MC+CE	Missile Repair, Air Defense Repair, Electronics Repair, Fixed Plant Communications Repair
OF (Operators & Food)	GI+AI+CA	Missile Crewmen, Air Defense Crewmen, Driver, Food Services
SC (Surveillance & Communications)	AR+WK+MC+SP	Target Acquisition and Combat Surveillance, Communications Operations
MM (Motor Maintenance)	ME+EI+SI+AI+CM	Mechanical and Aircraft Maintenance, Rails
GM (General Maintenance)	AR+GSB+MC+AI	Construction and Utilities, Chemical, Marine Petro.
CL (Clerical)	AR+WK+AD+CA	Administrative, Finance, Supply
ST (Skilled Technical)	AR+MK+GSB	Medical, Military Policeman, Intelligence, Data Processing, Air Control, Topography and Printing, Information and Audio Visual
GT (General Technical)	AR+WK	Not currently used for classification into a particular MOS

Table 3

LIST OF CHARACTERISTICS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY
COMPANY COMMANDERS AND FIRST SERGEANTS

Most Successful	Least Successful
JOB PERFORMANCE:	
Soldiers High on SQT	Not Prompt
Soldier of the Month	Low SQT Scores
Assignment To Duty Position Authorized at Higher Grade	Poor Job Performance
Overall Duty Performance (In Garrison and Field)	
Selection to Bde Machine Gun Team	
TROOP RESPONSIBILITIES	
Needs Little Supervision	Needs Constant Supervision
Accepts Responsibilities	Does Not Accept Responsibilities
RESPECT FOR AUTHORITY	
	Attitude
	Disrespect for Authority
MOTIVATION	
Initiative	Lacks Motivation
Self Motivation	
PERSONAL BEHAVIOR/DISCIPLINE	
Has Good Uniform Appearance	Drug Abuse
Has Good Moral and Personal Behavior	Article 15's
	Counseling Statements
	AWOL
	Has Poor Uniform Appearance
	Physical Condition

Table 4

Agreement Between Platoon Leaders
and Platoon Sergeants from Six Platoons
on First-Term Soldiers'
Job Performance

Number of First-Term Soldiers Being Rated	Correlation between platoon leader rankings and platoon sergeants rank- ings on first-term soldiers job Performance.
10	.80
13	.50
14	.72
10	.87
8	.96
11	.80

Table 5

(Total Panama Sample)

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients of All Criterion Measures in a Sample of 526 First-Term Soldiers

Variables	Mean	S.D.	Var. No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Awards	.14	.38	1									
Mil. Crs.	.24	.55	2	.56**								
Civ. Crs.	.03	.22	3	.15**								
SQT	68.64	14.85	4	.43**	.34**	.15*						
Lett. App.	.81	1.98	5			(237) .15*						
Hon. Grd.	.07	.28	6			(185) .37**	(181) .60**					
Art. 15	.61	.86	7									
Peer Rnk.	7.15	3.32	8									
Plt. Ldr. Rnk.	7.14	4.64	9				(64) .27*	(76) .38**	(96) .37**	(182) .61**		

NOTES:

- Blank cells > .05 • () = sample size
- * < .05 • Correlation coefficients were not corrected for
- ** < .01 • restriction in range.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations and Correlation Coefficients of All Criterion Measures
in a Sample of 294 First-Term Soldiers in MOS 11B

Variables	Mean	S.D.	Var. No.	Correlation Coefficients								
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Awards	.23	.48	1									
Mil. Crs.	.32	.58	2	(294) .63**								
Civ. Crs.	.01	.11	3	(294) .13*	(287) .15*	(157) .20*						
SQT	72.94	12.98	4	(157) .48**	(157) .37**	(154) .18*						
Lett. App.	.64	1.85	5			(127) .34**	(79) .27*					
Hon. Grad.	.03	.175	6				(127) .70**					
Art. 15	.62	.88	7									
Peer Rnk.	6.59	3.11	8									
Plt. Ldr. Rnk.	5.92	3.68	9							(69) .33**	(98) .61**	

NOTES:

- Blank cells > .05 • () = sample size
- * ≤ .05 • Correlation coefficients were not corrected
- ** ≤ .01 • for restriction in range.

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients of All Criterion Measures in a Sample of 126 First-Term Soldiers in MOS 95B

Variables	Mean	S.D.	Var. No.	Correlation Coefficients								
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Awards	.008	.09	1									
Mil. Crs.	.05	.25	2									
Civ. Crs.	.008	.09	3									
SQT	62.21	11.29	4									
Lett. App.	.71	1.27	5									
Hon. Grad.	.17	.46	6									
Art. 15	.67	.97	7									
Peer Rnk.	8.98	3.71	8									
Plt. Ldr. Rnk.	9.59	5.23	9									
											(53)	
											.55**	

NOTES:

- Blank cells \geq .05
- *
- **
- () = sample size
- Correlation coefficients were not corrected for restriction in range.

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Coefficients Between ASVAB Composites Scores and Performance Measures in a Sample of 294 First-Term Soldiers in MOS 11B

Variables	Mean	S.D.	SQT	Awards	Mil. Crs.	Correlation Coefficients					Peer Rnk.	Plt. Rnk.
						Civ. Crs.	Lett. App.	Hon. Grd.	Art. 15			
CO (Combat) ^a	90.21	12.95	.61**	.30**	.15*	.21*	.21*	.24*				
FA (Field Artillery)	89.00	15.94	.46**	.21**	.13*	.18*						-.24*
EL (Electronic Repair)	89.35	14.72	.45**	.20**		.17**		.21*				-.22*
OF (Operators & Food)	88.75	16.91	.41**	.23**	.13*	.12*						
SC (Surveill & Comm)	87.78	14.91	.42**	.23**	.15*	.23*		.23*				
MM (mechanic Maint)	89.00	15.28	.46**	.20**		.17**		.23*				
GM (General Maint)	87.30	15.65	.46**	.25**		.20**		.29**				
CL (Clerical)	87.38	15.51	.30**	.16**		.16**						
ST (Skilled Tech)	88.10	15.94	.37**	.20**		.24**		.29**				-.22*
GT (General Tech)	86.85	16.07	.33**	.18**		.20**						
N ^b =			149	283	283	283	283	124				105

NOTES:

- Blank cells
- *
- **
- ^a Correlation coefficients were not corrected for restrictions in range.
- ^b N's do not total 294 because of missing data.

Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients of ASVAB Composite Scores and Performance Measures in a Sample of 126 First-Term Soldiers in MOS 95B

Variables	Correlation Coefficients									
	Mean	S.D.	SQT	Award	Mil. Crs.	Civ. Crs.	Lett. App.	Hon. Grd.	Art. 15	Peer Rnk. Plt. Rnk.
CO (Combat)	96.34	14.84								-.24*
FA (Field Artillery)	103.40	12.03	.37**							-.31**
EL (Electronic Repair)	97.74	13.99	.31*							-.26*
OF (Operators & Food)	97.48	14.77	.30*							-.42**
SC (Surveill & Comm)	97.51	13.87	.31*							
MM (Mechanic Maint)	97.22	13.97	.34*							-.31**
GM (General Maint)	98.15	12.86	.44**							-.28*
CL (Clerical)	100.98	13.22								-.33**
ST (Skilled Tech) ^a	104.45	10.53	.63**		.24*					
GT (General Tech)	100.90	12.72	.37**							-.26*
N ^b =			51							51

NOTES:

- Blank cells .05
- * .05
- ** .01
- ^a Correlation coefficients were corrected for restriction in range
- ^b N's do not total 126 because of missing data

REFERENCES

Lord, F. M., & Novick, M. R. Statistical Theories of Mental Test Scores. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1968, pp. 140-144.

Maier, M. A., & Grafton, F. C., Aptitude Composites for ASVAB 8, 9, and 10. ARI Technical Paper 1308. Washington, DC: Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, May 1981.

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics). Aptitude Testing of Recruits (Unclassified), July 1980.

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics). Aptitude Testing of Recruits (Unclassified) September 1980.

- c. List some specific characteristics or problems which you have observed with these ten least successful first tour personnel which led you to select them. For example: One fell asleep while on guard duty.

Step 3. Please rate each of the following factors as to how critical you feel each factor is in indicating the quality of an individual's overall performance.

Importance Scale

- 5 = Extremely Important
 4 = Very Important
 3 = Important
 2 = Somewhat Important
 1 = Not Important At All

CO Overall 1SG

Means
Importance
Scale

Performance On-The-Job

2.71 2.88 3.04

Current Grade

3.50 3.75 4.00

Assignment to Duty Position
Authorized at Higher Grade

1.92 2.10 2.29

Time from E1 to E2

2.17 2.33 2.50

Time from E2 to E3

2.79 2.83 2.88

Time from E3 to E4

3.50 3.50 3.50

Time from E4 to E5

3.83 3.83 3.83

SQT Score

4.17 4.21 4.25

Reduction(s) for Inefficiency

4.00 4.10 4.21

Letter(s) Counseling for Inefficiency

Importance Scale

- 5 = Extremely Important
- 4 = Very Important
- 3 = Important
- 2 = Somewhat Important
- 1 = Not Important At All

Other

Importance
Scale

Presence of SMOS

3.00	<u>3.19</u>	3.38	Acquired OJT
3.46	<u>3.54</u>	3.63	Graduate MOS Awarding School

Awards and Decorations

3.92	<u>3.81</u>	3.71	Meritorious Service Medal
3.63	<u>3.67</u>	3.71	Army Commendation Medal (Merit)
2.33	<u>2.88</u>	3.42	Good Conduct Award
3.00	<u>3.38</u>	3.75	Letters of Recognition (Appreciation)

Discipline

Court Martial(s)

4.67	<u>4.23</u>	3.79	General
4.79	<u>4.48</u>	4.17	Special
4.54	<u>4.04</u>	3.54	Summary
3.88	<u>3.83</u>	3.79	Non-Judicial Punishments (Art. 15)
3.96	<u>3.94</u>	3.92	Days AWOL
4.58	<u>4.50</u>	4.42	Times AWOL

Importance Scale

- 5 = Extremely Important
- 4 = Very Important
- 3 = Important
- 2 = Somewhat Important
- 1 = Not Important At All

Administrative

Importance
Scale

Highest Security Clearance Attained

3.67	<u>3.69</u>	3.71	Top Secret
3.21	<u>3.52</u>	3.83	Secret
2.83	<u>3.08</u>	3.33	Confidential
3.63	<u>3.85</u>	4.08	Letter(s) of Indebtedness
2.83	<u>3.23</u>	3.63	Auto Accidents Held at Fault
4.38	<u>4.44</u>	4.50	Bar to Reenlistment

Self-Improvement Efforts

4.08	<u>4.23</u>	4.38	Educational Level Attained
3.88	<u>4.17</u>	4.46	Enrolled in GED Program
3.79	<u>4.02</u>	4.26	Enrolled in Non-Resident Military Education Program
3.54	<u>3.81</u>	4.08	Special Training
3.58	<u>3.83</u>	4.08	Schools Attended

Importance Scale

- 5 = Extremely Important
- 4 = Very Important
- 3 = Important
- 2 = Somewhat Important
- 1 = Not Important At All

Miscellaneous

Importance
Scale

3.96 3.94 3.92 Physical Profile

3.09 3.34 3.58 Peer Ratings (if they were systematically collected)

Please list any additional variables
we might have omitted

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

IMPORTANCE OF PERFORMANCE RATINGS

How important to you are each of the following behaviors in evaluating the enlistee.

Importance Scale

- 5 = Extremely Important
- 4 = Very Important
- 3 = Important
- 2 = Somewhat Important
- 1 = Not Important At All

- | | | | |
|------|-------------|------|---|
| 4.58 | <u>4.67</u> | 4.75 | 1. Performs job satisfactorily. |
| 3.71 | <u>3.69</u> | 3.67 | 2. Has difficulty communicating effectively. |
| 4.50 | <u>4.48</u> | 4.46 | 3. Sets a good example for co-workers. |
| 4.71 | <u>4.63</u> | 4.54 | 4. Accepts responsibility. |
| 4.63 | <u>4.54</u> | 4.46 | 5. Resists authority. |
| 3.83 | <u>4.15</u> | 4.46 | 6. Shows good judgement in expressing opinions. |
| 4.67 | <u>4.48</u> | 4.29 | 7. Needs constant supervision. |
| 3.96 | <u>4.06</u> | 4.17 | 8. Conforms to Army appearance standards. |
| 3.79 | <u>3.73</u> | 3.67 | 9. Has been a disciplinary problem within the last six months. |
| 4.08 | <u>4.23</u> | 4.38 | 10. Works well with others. |
| 3.88 | <u>3.94</u> | 4.00 | 11. Possesses capacity to acquire knowledge/group concepts. |
| 4.08 | <u>4.10</u> | 4.13 | 12. Demonstrates appropriate knowledge and expertise in assigned tasks. |
| 3.88 | <u>4.00</u> | 4.13 | 13. Maintains appropriate level of physical fitness. |
| 4.46 | <u>4.46</u> | 4.46 | 14. Performs well under physical and mental stress. |
| 4.08 | <u>4.10</u> | 4.13 | 15. Was absent without leave (AWOL). |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

Appendix B

Factors identified as 'Extremely Important' for indicating the quality of an individual's overall job performance.

1. Performs job satisfactorily.
2. Accepts responsibility.
3. Resists authority.

Factors identified as 'Very Important' for indicating the quality of an individual's overall job performance.

1. Times AWOL
2. Special Court Martial
3. Sets a good example for co-workers.
4. Needs constant supervision.
5. Performs well under physical and mental stress.
6. Bar to reenlistment.
7. General Court Martial
8. Educational level attained.
9. Works well with others.
10. Reductions for inefficiency.
11. Enrolled in GED program.
12. Shows good judgment in expressing opinions.
13. Letters counseling for inefficiency.
14. Demonstrates appropriate knowledge and expertise in assigned tasks.
15. Was AWOL.
16. Conforms to Army appearance standards.
17. Summary Court Martial.
18. Enrolled in non-resident Military Education Program.
19. Maintains appropriate level of physical fitness.
20. Days AWOL.
21. Possesses capacity to acquire knowledge/group concepts.
22. Physical profile.
23. Letters of indebtedness.
24. Schools attended.